

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the March 4, 2010 final Office action and have amended claims to more clearly set forth the invention. This Amendment D amends claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 27, 33, 40, and 41.

Claims 1, 3-16, and 19-46 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, and 19-23

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-16, and 19-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,659,693 to Hansen et al. (Hansen) in view of U.S Patent No. 5,513,342 to Leong et al (Leong). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

As discussed below, claims 1, 8, 15, and 20 relate to sizing a tile within a sidebar. Aspects of these claims provide for both automatic and manual resizing of tiles within the sidebar without requiring the resizing the sidebar itself. In particular, aspects of the claims "allow both [an] application to choose its own size and allow users to override that size." (Application, page 2, lines 24-25). Accordingly, aspects of the claims "make[] it possible to build tiles that use an appropriate amount of space, wherein users are able to stop poorly designed tiles from taking up too much space" in a particularly sized sidebar (Application, page 2, lines 25-27).

A1. Claim 1

The system of claim 1 includes "an automatic sizing routine for, during the automatic sizing routine, automatically sizing the tile within the sidebar responsive to a change in tile content of the tile " and "a manual sizing routine which allows a user, during a manual mode, to manually set the size of the tile within the sidebar ***without resizing the sidebar.***" (emphasis

added). "[T]he tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile." "*[A]fter the user manually sets the size of the tile, the manual mode is entered during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in tile content is restricted.*"

Thus, claim 1 highlights that the system is configured to operate in both an automatic mode and a manual mode for resizing the tile within the sidebar. Specifically, the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile and thereafter the tile is operated in the manual mode. Additionally, amended claim 1 clarifies that the resizing of the tile does not invoke a resizing of the sidebar in the manual mode. Thus, the system of claim 1 provides the convenience of tile resizing without the distraction of resizing the sidebar to accommodate the resized tiles.

Hansen and Leong, whether read alone or in combination, fail to teach several features of claim 1. First, neither Hansen nor Leong teach a manual sizing routine which allows a user to manually set the size of the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar. Hansen discloses two methods for resizing a tile. First, Hansen discloses that the tiles can be resized as a group by manually resizing the dashboard interface. Specifically, Hansen teaches that the tiles located within the dashboard interface are proportionately resized when the user resizes the dashboard interface. "For example, when cursor 56 and mouse 60 are used to increase the size of dashboard interface 10, an additional row of dates are added to calendar 140, as shown in FIG. 27." (Hansen, col. 6, lines 35-39).

Second, Hansen discloses that the tiles located in the dashboard interface can be individually manually resized by a user. "This is done by placing cursor 56 over the border of a panel and pressing the 'Shift' key on keyboard 69. A gray border then appears around the panel. By placing cursor 56 over this gray border and depressing button 62, it is possible to use mouse 60 to individually size the panel." (Hansen, col. 5, lines 19-23). For example, "[i]n FIG. 15, cursor 56 and mouse 60 have been used to enlarge the vertical size of printer manager panel 32" located in the dashboard interface. (Hansen, col. 5, lines 27-28). A comparison of FIGS. 14 and 15 illustrates that the dashboard interface is accordingly enlarged to accommodate the enlarged printer manager panel. Thus, both of the methods taught by Hansen to resize a tile require the dashboard interface to be resized. As such, Hansen fails to teach "a manual sizing routine which allows a user, during a manual mode, to manually set the size of the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar" as recited by claim 1.

Leong fails to cure these deficiencies of Hansen. Leong merely teaches a "software presentation system [that] automatically adjusts window size and positioning in accordance with window environment changes." (Leong, Abstract). Accordingly, as referenced by the Office, Leong merely teaches an "automatic sizing routine." (Office action, page 3). Thus, Leong fails to teach a manual mode. As such, Leong fails to teach "a manual sizing routine which allows a user, during a manual mode, to manually set the size of the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar" as recited by claim 1.

Furthermore, neither Hansen nor Leong teach a manual mode during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in tile content is restricted. In response to the Office's assertion this feature is not recited by the claims (Office action page 17-18), Applicants point out that claim 1 recites "wherein after the user manually sets the size of the tile the manual mode is entered during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in tile content is restricted." The Office further notes that Hansen teaches that the user interface graphic display shell includes a resource panel display which "is displayed within graphic boundaries of the user interface graphic display shell at a screen region which maintains a user-specified position relative to said vertical row of application program panel displays." (Office action, page 3 citing Hansen at col. 8, lines 34-37). However, Hansen merely teaches that the position, not the size, of the resource panel display is maintained within interface graphic display shell. Thus, Hansen fails to teach or suggest a "manual mode . . . during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in content is restricted" as recited by claim 1.

Leong fails to cure these deficiencies of Hansen since, as discussed above, Leong merely teaches an "automatic sizing routine." (See Office action, page 3). Thus, Leong fails to teach a manual mode. As such, Leong, like Hansen, fails to teach a "manual mode . . . during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in content is restricted" as recited by claim 1.

Moreover, even if Hansen could be interpreted to teach the manual mode of claim 1 and Leong could be interpreted to teach the automatic mode of claim 1, the combined system still fails to include the elements of claim 1 which recite that "the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile" and "after the user manually sets the size of the tile, the manual mode is entered." Instead the combined system could merely be selected to resize the tiles in either the automatic mode or the manual mode exclusive of the other mode

rather than selectively operating between the two modes based on the user's interaction with the size of the tile.

In view of the foregoing, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

A2. Claim 8

Claim 8 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for sizing a tile arranged with one or more other tiles in a side bar. The computer-readable medium includes "an automatic sizing component for, during an automatic mode, automatically sizing the tile within the sidebar responsive to a change in tile content of the tile" and "a manual sizing component for allowing a user, during a manual mode, to manually size the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar." "[T]he tile is operated in the automatic mode until the manual sizing component is used" and "use of the manual sizing component places the tile in the manual mode." "[W]hen the tile is in the manual mode, the tile is restricted from being automatically resized."

As discussed above, Leong fails to teach a manual sizing mode and the manual sizing routines disclosed by Hansen require that sidebar be resized. Thus, Hansen and Leong, alone or in combination fail to teach "a manual sizing component for allowing a user, during a manual mode, to manually size the tile within the sidebar without resizing the sidebar" as recited by claim 8.

Additionally, the manual sizing routines disclosed by Hansen mention maintaining a general position of a tile, which is completely different from preventing a tile from being resized. Since Leong fails to disclose a manual sizing routine, Hansen and Leong, alone or in combination, fail to teach sizing a tile such that "when the tile is in the manual mode, the tile is restricted from being automatically resized" as recited by claim 8.

Further even if Hansen could be interpreted to teach such a manual mode of claim 8 and Leong could be interpreted to teach the automatic mode of claim 8, the combined invention still

fails to include the elements of claim 8 which recite that "the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the manual sizing component is used, said use of the manual sizing component places the tile in the manual mode."

Accordingly, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 8 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 8 is allowable.

A3. Claim 15

Claim 15 is directed to a system for resizing a tile on a display. The system includes, in part, "a first routine for, during an automatic mode, automatically resizing the tile within the sidebar responsive to a change in tile content during an automatic mode, wherein user approval is required to resize the tile above a predefined maximum size." The system also includes "a second routine for allowing a user, during a manual mode, to manually resize the tile within the without resizing the side bar." "[T]he tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile or the user declines a request to automatically resize the tile above the predefined maximum size." "[A]fter the user manually sets the size of the tile or the user declines a request to automatically resize the tile above the predefined maximum size, the manual mode is entered during which further automatic sizing of the tile responsive to a change in tile content is restricted."

In additions to the features discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 8, Hansen and Leong are both entirely silent as to obtaining user approval to resize a tile above a predefined maximum size. Thus, whether read alone or in combination, Hansen and Leong additionally fail to teach or suggest the elements of claim 15 which teach "the tile is operated in the automatic mode until the user manually sets the size of the tile or the user declines a request to automatically resize the tile above the predefined maximum size."

Accordingly, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally,

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 15 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 15 is allowable.

A4. Claim 20

Claim 20 is directed to "a method for sizing a tile arranged in a sidebar, said sidebar having a defined display size". The method includes "initially setting the tile in an automatic mode," "automatically sizing the tile within the sidebar having the defined display size responsive to a change in tile content during the automatic mode," and "allowing a user to manually set the size of the tile within the sidebar having the defined display size." The method includes "resetting the tile from the automatic mode to a manual mode when the user manually sets the size of the tile," "wherein while the tile is in the manual mode, preventing the tile from being automatically resized."

As discussed above, Leong fails to teach a manual sizing mode and the manual sizing routines disclosed by Hansen fail to teach or suggest a manual mode in which the tiles can be resized by a user while the sidebar is maintained a constant size ("allowing a user to manually set the size of the tile within the sidebar having the defined display size"). Additionally, neither Hansen nor Leong, together or in combination teach "while the tile is in the manual mode, preventing the tile from being automatically resized." Further even if Hansen could be interpreted to teach such a manual mode of claim 20 and Leong could be interpreted to teach the automatic mode of claim 20, the combined invention still fails to a method that "reset[s] the tile from the automatic mode to a manual mode when the user manually sets the size of the tile."

Accordingly, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 20 are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 20 is allowable.

B. Claims 27-31, 33, 34, 38-41, 42, and 46

Claims 27-31, 33, 34, 38-41, 42, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of U.S Patent No. 5,363,481 to Tilt (Tilt).

Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

B1. Claim 27

Claim 27 is directed to a method for sizing a tile displaying content on a display. The method includes, in part, "tracking an amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized" and "automatically resizing the tile within the sidebar a plurality of times without resizing the sidebar based at least in part on changes in the first content." "[T]he automatic resizing of the tile is permitted when the amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise." The method includes "providing the resized tile within the sidebar having the defined size on the display, said resized tile displaying second content." Thus, the method of claim 27 prevents a tile from changing size too frequently ,which could be distracting or annoying to a user. (Application, page 4, lines 11-12).

The Office correctly notes that neither Hansen nor Leong discloses determining whether a tile should be resized based on the amount of time between sequential sizing events. (Office action, page 12). Tilt fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen and Leong. Tilt merely teaches that a timer is initiated when a user selects a knob for scrolling through a menu. As long as the knob is being turned the timer is restarted. When the knob is no longer being turned the timer is permitted to count until it expires. When the timer expires, the menu is closed, taking the menu off the display. (Tilt, col. 2, lines 24-33). In other words, Tilt teaches tracking an amount of time since a user selects a menu control, not the "amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized" as recited by claim 27.

As such Tilt, like Hansen and Leong, fails to teach or suggest "tracking an amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized" and "automatically resizing the tile when the amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise" as recited by claim 27. In view of the foregoing, the cited references, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 27.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend

directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 27 are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claim from which they depend is allowable.

B2. Claims 33 and 41

Claim 33 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer executable components for sizing a tile. Claim 41 is directed to a system for resizing a tile on a computer display. Claims 33 and 41 each include an element "tracking an amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized." Additionally, both claims include an element for "automatically resizing the tile when the amount of time that has elapsed since the tile has been resized is greater than a predetermined time interval, and wherein the tile is prevented from being automatically resized otherwise."

Thus, for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with claim 27, Hansen, Leong, and Tilt, whether read alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claims 33 and 41. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of amended claims 33 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims that depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 33 and 41, respectively, are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable.

C. Claims 6-7, 10-11, and 24-26

Claims 6-7, 10-11, 17-18, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Nielsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,437,758). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Claims 6-7; 10-11; and 24-26 depend from amended independent claims 1, 8, and 20, respectively, and add further limitations to those in claims 1, 8, and 20. Inasmuch as Nielsen merely discloses positioning information on a display and, thus, fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen and Leong, Applicants submit that claims 6-7, 10-11, and 24-26 are allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claims 1, 8, and 20 are allowable.

D. Claims 32, 37, and 43-45

Claims 32, 37, and 43-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt and in further view of Nielsen. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Claims 32; 37, and 43-45 depend from amended independent claims 27, 33, and 41 respectively, and add further limitations to those in claims 27, 33, and 41. Tilt relates to tracking an amount of time since a user selects a menu control, and closing the window in response accordingly. Because Tilt fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen, Leong, and Nielsen as explained above, Applicants submit that claims 32, 37, and 43-45 are allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claims 27, 33, and 41 are allowable.

E. Claim 40

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt and in further view of Southgate (U.S. Patent No. 5,880,725). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claim.

Claim 40 depends from amended independent claim 33, and adds further limitations to those in claim 33. Southgate is directed to resizing a plurality of windows on a display, which is completely different than resizing tiles within a single sidebar on the display. Thus, Southgate fails to cure the deficiencies of the other applied references. As such, Applicants submit that claim 40 is allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claim 33 is allowable.

F. Claim 13

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Carpenter (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,997). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claim.

Claim 13 depends from amended independent claim 8, and adds further limitations to those in claim 8. Carpenter teaches the same dashboard interface as taught by Hansen, and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen and Leong for the reasons discussed above. As such,

Applicants submit that claim 13 is allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claim 8 is allowable.

G. Claims 35-36

Claims 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Leong in view of Tilt and in further view of Carpenter. Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Claims 35-36 depend from amended independent claim 33, and add further limitations to those in claim 33. As such, Applicants submit that claims 35-36 are allowable for at least the same reasons that amended independent claim 33 is allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nancy A. Swiezynski/

Nancy A. Swiezynski, Reg. No. 65,936
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 345-7000

/jag